

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-7 remain pending.

The Examiner has indicated that the trademarks INTEL, SPARC, and SOLARIS should be capitalized. The specification has been amended accordingly.

The Examiner has indicated that the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: figure 2, item "220". The Applicant notes that item "220" is mentioned in the paragraph beginning on page 15, line 13 and respectfully asks that the objection be withdrawn. It is believed that the attached replacement drawings overcome the Examiner's remaining objections to the drawings.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure that is not enabling. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The claim limitations cited in the Office Action are enabled, without limitation, by the specification at page 39, line 9 – page 41, line 2. Those of ordinary skill in the art would know that a computer configured to run properly under an applicable protocol, such as the Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMP), would respond with a specific packet prescribed by the protocol in the event that a connectionless port to which a received message was directed were not in use. In particular, at page 40, lines 4 – 10, the specification makes clear that in the embodiment being discussed in that passage the intruder is sent the packet that would be sent as prescribed by the ICMP protocol in the event that no software were bound to the port in question. Those of ordinary skill in the art would know upon reading this disclosure the precise packet that would be sent to the intruder,

as prescribed by the ICMP or other applicable protocol, under the circumstances described. As such, the specification is enabling under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Atkinson, RFC 1826, "IP Authentication Header," 1995.

With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner cites Atkinson page 10, last paragraph. In the cited paragraph, Atkinson teaches that when a packet causes an error to be reported back to the sender via ICMP, if the packet is too large, it might not be possible for the sender to authenticate the error message, e.g., if the error message includes the original message and the resulting combined message is so large that it is truncated. In the passage cited in the Office Action, Atkinson describes a case that may *cause* an authentication failure, but does not describe what happens *after* an authentication failure.

Atkinson describes what happens after an authentication failure on page 9, last paragraph: "If the algorithm determines that the data and the Authentication Header do not match, then the receiver SHOULD discard the received IP datagram as invalid and MUST record the authentication failure in the system log or audit log." Atkinson teaches, therefore, that the incoming packet is discarded and logged in response to an authentication failure. In contrast, Claim 1 recites "configuring the external device to reply to any packet in which the required valid authorization information is not present with the packet that would be generated by the computer in response to an attempt to communicate via the connectionless port at a time when no device was connected to the connectionless port." Atkinson does not describe replying with a packet. Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Atkinson.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 1, claims 6 and 7 recite configuring the external device "to reply to any packet in which the required valid authorization information is not present with the packet that would be generated by the computer in response to an attempt to communicate via the connectionless port at a time when no device was connected to the connectionless port." As such, claims 6 and 7 are believed to be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Clover Huang
Registration No. P55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014